SOCIAL PLANNING
COUNCIL
OF
METROPOLITAN
TORONTO

WORKING FAMILIES PROJECT

Work
&Family

A Report of the Working Families Project of the
Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto

February, 1986

By
Laura C. Johnson

ISBN: 0-919456-27-8 $6.00

WORKING FAMILIES:
WORKPLACE SUPPORTS FOR FAMILIES

WORKING FAMILIES PROJECT COMMITTEE

CO-CHAIRPERSONS:

SALLY PERKINS
SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

FERN STIMPSON
MANUFACTURERS LIFE

JOANNE CAMPBELL, ALDERMAN
CITY OF TORONTO

MAUREEN DONLEVY,
ESSO PETROLEUM, CANADA

JOSEPHINE GRAYSON,
WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

SUE GRIGGS,
MANUFACTURERS LIFE

JUDITH JORDAN-AUSTIN,
SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

ROBERT KATZ,
CANADA EMPLOYMENT AND
IMMIGRATION COMMISSION

KENISE KILBRIDE,
SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

BRIGID O'REILLY,
ONTARIO COMMITTEE ON THE
STATUS OF WOMEN

MARGARET SMITH,
LABOUR COUNCIL OF
METROPOLITAN TORONTO

JULIE WHITE,
GREAT NORTHERN APPAREL INC.,
A DIVISION OF LEVI STRAUSS AND CO.

LAURA C. JOHNSON,
PROGRAM DIRECTOR,
SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research project would not have been possible without the assistance of a great many individuals. First, and foremost, we would like to acknowledge the contribution of our respondents: the 494 employers who took the time to complete our survey questionnaire; the 15 employers who consented to an additional hour-long personal interview; and the 20 busy, working parents who took the time to tell us their views of alternative work arrangements.

The staff of the Working Families Project included several individuals who played central roles in the project. Pauline Walsh's thorough work at the outset of the field work contributed to the survey's high response rate. Elka Klein monitored the data collection, supervised coding and data entry, and organized the initial computer analysis of the data. Cathy Paperny conducted the in-depth interviews with working parents. Judy Rogers of Ruston/Tomany & Associates Ltd. was responsible for the qualitative assessment of employer attitudes toward alternative work arrangements. Diana Bryden and David Crepp provided research assistance during the analysis of data.

Gary Korzenstein and Joe Silva of the Metropolitan Toronto Department of Planning provided valuable assistance with the sampling of employment establishments.

Mary Lew, Working Families Project secretary, has played a key role in design, layout, and production of the research instruments and preparation of the various project reports.

Executive Summary

Working parents and others with family responsibilities encounter stress from the competing demands of work and family life. This stress is a problem in workplaces and families across Canada. The Working Families Project* of the Social Planning Council approaches this issue from the perspective of the workplace, considering ways in which modifications to traditional patterns of employment may support family life.

This is a survey research project investigating 'alternative work arrangements' which may reduce work/family stress. The study is concerned with programs which offer alternatives to the traditional, full-time job, as well as workplace programs which offer services to families. The particular programs under study include: flexible work schedules; part-time work with prorated benefits, job-sharing; parental and family leave; work-at-home; and work-related day care.

The study involved a mailed survey of a random, representative sample of some 500 Metropolitan Toronto employing establishments representing public and private sector employers with at least 50 employees. The quantitative survey data were supplemented by information from personal interviews with small samples of employers who have alternative work arrangements, and working parents involved with such workplace arrangements.

Following is a summary of the study findings:

While none of the alternative work arrangements is available in the

---

*This research was supported, in part, by a grant from the Ontario Women's Directorate. Responsibility for the content of this report rests with the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.

majority of the workplaces, the most prevalent are policies and practices which allow for reduced or flexible work hours, e.g. flex-time (available in 25% of workplaces) and part-time work with prorated benefits (available in about 20% of workplaces).

Policies which allow employees short-term paid leave for family-related responsibilities are available in some 18% of workplaces.

While 14.5% of these large employers offer maternity or adoption leave beyond that required by law, there are only 5.4 per cent of workplaces in which male employees are entitled to paternity or adoption leave. Among those that do, only the shortest periods tend to be leave with pay.

Job-sharing, a voluntary arrangement in which two people hold responsibility for what was formerly one full-time position, is among the least prevalent programs, available in only 5.7% of the workplaces surveyed.

Work-related day care, a service which has received considerable recent attention from governments and the media, was found to be available in only 0.4% of workplaces.

The study investigated the extent of overlap between these various alternative work arrangements. To what extent were employers likely to offer more than one such program? Fewer than 10% of employers have three or more of the arrangements under study. At the extreme are employers with six different arrangements. Only 0.2% of the sample

offer this array of programs, representing only 7 Metropolitan Toronto employers.

One of the study objectives was to determine the characteristics of those employers who do offer alternative work arrangements. In particular, what are the influences of size and industrial sector on such corporate policies? The study observed that alternative work arrangements are considerably more likely to be found in larger establishments. Employers in the public sector were found to offer significantly more alternative work arranagements than did their private sector counterparts.

Viewed from the perspective of working parents, alternative work arrangements do appear to aid parents in coping with child care needs. Interviews with parents working on flex-time, sharing jobs, and working from home indicated that they felt that these arrangements were very important in helping them to juggle competing demands of work and family. While some complained that they were deprived of benefits to which they felt they should have been entitled, most felt, nonetheless, privileged to work in such arrangements.

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	ii
Introduction	1
Research Methods	3
Definitions of Alternative Work Arrangements	4
Prevalence of Alternative Work Arrangements	5
Trends and Patterns in Provision of Alternative Work Arrangements	8
Employer Interest in Alternative Work Arrangements	12
The Parents' Perspective on Alternative Work Arrangements	15
Summary and Conclusion	20
APPENDIX: A Description of Research Methods for Mailed Survey of Employers	

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1	Prevalance of Alternative Work Arrangements	5
Table 2	Prevalence of Additional Workplace Supports to Families	9
Table 3	Distribution of Number of Alternative Work Arrangements	9
Table 4	Relationship Between Number of Alternative Work Arrangements and Size of Employment Establishment	10
Table 5	Relationships Between Numbers of Alternative Work Arrangements and Industrial Sector (public or private)	11
Table 6	Employers Indicating Interest in Alternative Work Arrangements	13

APPENDIX

Table A1	Distribution of Sampled Employers and Population of Establishments by size of Establishments with 50 or more Employees	3
Table A2	Employer Sample Size and Response Rate	4
Table A3	Comparison of Non-Respondents and Respondents by Industrial Sector	5
Table A4	Comparison of Non-Respondents and Respondents by Size of Establishment	6

WORKING FAMILIES: WORKPLACE SUPPORTS FOR FAMILIES IN CANADA*

INTRODUCTION

> "As soon as the bell rings for morning coffee break, the women in the plant make a mad dash to line up for the phone to check with their babysitters that their children are O.K. In the afternoon, the phone line-ups are even longer, as mothers of school children call to check that their kids are safe at home."

Work/family conflict is a source of stress in workplaces and families across Canada. There is a growing public awareness that competing demands of work and family life can have adverse effects on both job performance and family life. Many working people, especially parents of young children, experience considerable stress as they try to juggle full-time employment and family responsibilities. The Social Planning Council's Working Families Project was designed to examine the workplace side of this equation, and to consider how modifications to traditional patterns of employment might support family life.

This is a survey research project investigating 'alternative work arrangements' which may reduce the pressure on working parents and others with family responsibilities. The study is concerned with programs which offer alternatives to the traditional, full-time, 'nine-to-five' job, as well as workplace programs which offer services to families. The particular arrangements under study include: flexible work schedules; part-time work with prorated benefits, job-sharing, paternity, maternity and adoption leave; work at home; and work-related day care.

The study involved a mail-out survey to a random, representative sample of some 500 employing establishments in Metropolitan Toronto representing

public, quasi-public and private organizations with at least 50 employees.

The quantitative part of the research was valuable in gauging the extent to which alternative work arrangements were currently available in large workplaces. The survey determined the prevalence of the various alternative work arrangements, as well as the levels of employers' interest in such programs. Such survey data cannot answer questions about the motivations of employers to introduce such programs, or about the value of such programs for parents and others with family responsibilities. To respond to these questions, the Working Families Project conducted qualitative research involving in-depth, personal interviews with a sub-sample of 15 selected employers who reported alternative work arrangements*, and with 20 selected employees involved in such work arrangements. These qualitative data are useful in eliciting the motivations, attitudes and experiences of the respondents, and helpful in understanding how such arrangements actually operate. The selected respondents are not assumed to be representative, and these qualitative findings cannot therefore be generalized to the larger populations of employers or workers.

The following report presents the results of the quantitative survey along with highlights from the qualitative phases of the study.

---

* A detailed report of the qualitative research on employers'attitudes is available under separate cover: Attitudes Towards Alternative Work Arrangements: A Qualitative Assessment Among Employers in Metropolitan Toronto,Social Planning Council, January, 1986.

RESEARCH METHODS*

The focus of the Working Families Project employer survey was the workplace with at least fifty employees, since the majority of Metropolitan Toronto's working population (61.2%) is employed in establishments of that size.** A questionnaire was mailed to a sample of approximately 1,000 employing establishments in Metropolitan Toronto, drawn from the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Department's Land Use and Assessment Data Bank. The sample was stratified by size into medium (50-99 employees), large (100-499 employees), and very large (500 or more employees) organizations.

A review of the literature on alternative work arrangements suggests that such programs are more likely to be found in very large employment establishments. Based on this finding, the survey over-sampled establishments with 500 or more employees. The resulting data have been weighted to compensate for this skewed sampling.

A total of 494 completed questionnaires was returned, representing a response rate of approximately 49%. The large sample size, combined with the relatively high response rate, permits generalization of the survey results to the larger population of 3,803 Metropolitan Toronto workplaces with 50 or more employees.

---

* See Appendix for a detailed discussion of the employer survey research design and methods.

**Metropolitan Toronto Department of Planning, Employment, Land Use and Assessment Data Bank, 1984, p. 3.16.

DEFINITIONS OF ALTERNATIVE WORK ARRANGEMENTS

The survey inquired about the following alternative work arrangements:

Job-Sharing: A voluntary work arrangement in which two people hold responsibility for what was formerly one full-time position. Salary and benefits are prorated according to hours worked.

Flexible Work Schedules: Work schedules with variable start and stop times, generally including a core time during which employees must be at work.

Part-time Work: The part-time work arrangements under consideration are those which entitle employees to benefits prorated according to hours worked.

Work-at-Home: This is an option in which employees work at home on a regular basis, possibly using computer and communications technology, and being subject to remote supervision.

Work-Related Day Care: Includes a variety of arrangements in which the provision of children's day care is linked to the parents' place of employment.

Maternity, Paternity and Adoption Leave: These programs provide for leave of absence on a paid or unpaid basis to enable parents to spend time at home with a new child.

Personal/Family Leave: Provides for paid personal leave specifically for an employee's family responsibilities, e.g., for care of a sick child or an elderly parent, or to meet with a child's teacher.

• PREVALENCE OF ALTERNATIVE WORK ARRANGEMENTS

Flexible Schedules

Results of the survey indicate that while none of the alternative work arrangements is available in the majority of workplaces, the most prevalent are policies and practices which allow for reduced or flexible work hours (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Prevalence of Alternative Work Arrangements

Arrangement	Projected Population of Employers (3803) %
Flex-time	25.0
Part-time	19.9
Personal/family leave	17.0
Maternity leave	14.5
Paternity leave	5.4
Job-sharing	5.7
Work-at-home	4.5
Workplace day care	.4

"Now I can work early, from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., or maybe 8:00 to 4:00 p.m. It would be more stressfull more difficult if I wasn't on this flextime. I used to worry about not picking my kids up on time. At the day care, they close by 6:00. The kids worry that you've forgotten about them when they see most of the other kids gone. Also, with standard time, by the time you got home, did dinner, it would be the kids' bedtime. There'd be no time to play with them."

> "I'm not one of those people who want a career. I'd rather be at home with my children. I stay at this job because of the flexible hours. I'm working because I have to... I think more employers should offer flex-time".

Highest in frequency among the programs was flexible work schedules ('flex-time'), which is available in 25% of the workplaces. Part-time work with prorated benefits is available in just under 20% of the workplaces.

Personal and Parental Leave

Policies which allow employees paid leave for family-related responsibilities are available in 18% of the workplaces. It is interesting to note that while 14.5% of large employers offer maternity or adoption leave provisions beyond those legislated by government, there are only 5.4% of workplaces in which male employees are entitled to paternity or adoption leave. Among those employers that do offer paternity leave, the leave period ranges from one day to twelve weeks, with only the shortest periods (up to four days) provided on a paid basis.

Job-Sharing

> "My partner and I initiated the job-sharing arrangement ourselves. It was the job advertisement that sparked us off to apply jointly to share the position. It was a new job, without a very clear job description. We thought that, together, we brought a good number of skills that complemented each other into the job".

> "When you get an organization that gives you permission to job-share, you say 'Thank-you, thank-you'. You don't want to rock the boat. I think it has to be done very tactfully. My [job-sharing] partner and I happened to have a great

> boss at the time that we applied for job-sharing, and she plugged for us. When we applied to share this job because of having families, it was new for the employer".

Among the least prevalent programs is job-sharing, which is available at 5.7% of the workplaces. Those employers reporting job-sharing describe a variety of arrangements. In one workplace, a shared secretarial position is filled by one secretary who works full-time for two weeks, followed by another who works for two weeks. Several employers report that two workers share one full-time position, splitting the work week with one working two days, another three days. One employer in the retail trade predicts that job-sharing is a form of employment that is 'bound to show up in the future'.

Work-at-Home

> "If you researchers find something good in work-at-home, let me know. You miss out on a lot when you're not home with your children".

> "Our firm has about 50 employees, and there are now about 2/3 of them who work from home at some point in time... Most of the people in our firm who work from home do so because of family responsibilities. I'm in that position. I have a daughter at home and I prefer to work at home if I can, because I can spend time with her. And when she's in bed, I can work away on the system. One of my partners is in the same position, and he prefers to work at home. I think that homework is a viable option for the future. When the office becomes a system rather than a place, it's independent of the physical location and it's no longer necessary for people to travel to work every day. And they can arrange their schedules so that if they have creative work to do like writing, or software development, they can work at home... In our case, homework is definitely contributing to our productivity."

Work-at-home is reported by only 4.5% of the employers. Approximately half of these employ homeworkers to do industrial sewing or other manufacturing work-at-home; the other half employ computer homeworkers.

Work-Related Day Care

Work-related day care is the least prevalent of the programs under study, being available at only 0.4% of workplaces.

• Other Workplace Supports For Families

The survey also determined the prevalence of a variety of other programs which might serve as workplace supports to families. The results, as summarized in Table 2, indicate that while a majority of the employers contribute to medical and dental plans which cover employees' families, and a fair number provide counselling programs, including relocation counselling, it is rare for employers to be involved in parent education programs or to provide any financial support for employees' day care costs.

TRENDS AND PATTERNS IN PROVISION OF ALTERNATIVE WORK ARRANGEMENTS

Multiple Programs

To what extent is there overlap among alternative work arrangements? Do employers who offer one of these arrangements tend to offer others as well? As shown in Table 3, fewer than 10% of employers have three or more of the arrangements under study, representing in total about 300 Metropolitan Toronto employers. At the extreme are employers with six different arrangements. Only 0.2% of the sample offer this array of alternative work programs, representing only 7 Metropolitan Toronto employers.

TABLE 2

Prevalence of Additional Workplace Supports to Families

Program	Projected Population of Employers (3803) %
Employee Assistance Programs	16.9
Relocation Counselling	16.7
Employer contributions to family medical plans (e.g., OHIP)	85.7
Employer contributions to family dental plans	71.9
Subsidies to parents for day care	.2
Parent Education Seminars	2.7

TABLE 3

Distribution of Number of Alternative Work Arrangements

Total Alternative Work Arrangements	Projected Population of Employers (3803) %
0	46.0
1	30.5
2	14.0
3	4.6
4	3.6
5	1.0
6	0.2

Influence of Size and Sector

Since the employer survey results demonstrate that relatively few employers offer alternatives to the traditional, 'nine-to-five' job, it is of interest to examine the characteristics of those employers that do offer such programs. In particular, what are the influences of size and of industrial sector on such corporate policies?

For analytical purposes, the employer sample was categorized into three groups according to their total number of alternative work arrangements. There were 46.0% with no alternative work arrangements; 30.5% with one; and a total of 23.4% with two or more such programs.

Examination of the relationship between the size of the employment establishments and the number of alternative work arrangements reveals that such arrangements are considerably more likely to be found in larger establishments (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

Relationship Between Number of Alternative Work Arrangements and Size of Employment Establishment

Number of Alternative Work Arrangements	50 - 99 employees	100 - 499 employees	500+ employees
0	49.4	46.4	13.8
1	32.5	29.5	20.7
2 or more	18.1	24.0	65.5
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0
(n)	(249)	(200)	(29)

$x^2(4df) = 33.488$

$P < .001$

The study also compared public and private sector employers* with regard to the number of alternative work arrangements offered (see Table 5). The public sector employers offer significantly more alternative work arrangements than do their private sector counterparts.

TABLE 5
Relationships between Numbers of Alternative Work Arrangements and Industrial Sector (public or private)

Number of Alternative Work Arrangements	Industrial Sector	
	Public %	Private %
0	15.6	48.9
1	31.1	30.2
2 or more	53.3	20.9
Total %	100.0	100.0
(n)	(45)	(417)

x^2 (2d.f.) = 27.735

$P < .001$

An interview with one public sector personnel director elucidates this finding:

> "It is, of course, much easier for the public sector to do these things. The government makes the decision that it wants something to happen, and they just increase taxes to pay for it. We do what we are told to do, and don't have to worry about the money. If the government wants it to

---

*A rough classification of employers into public and private sectors was made by grouping education, public administration, health and welfare services, transportation, communication and utilities into the public sector, with all others considered to be private.

> happen, they get the money to make it happen. It is much different in the private sector. They operate in a competititive environment. They'd have to raise their prices, and then might not be competitive...."

Who Gets The Alternative Work Arrangements?

The interviews with employers suggested a greater willingness to allow the flexibility of various alternative work arrangements for their more highly skilled, highly trained employees. It is the threat of withdrawal of valuable service that appears to motivate employers to consider work arrangements involving reduced time or flexible scheduling:

> "She came to us after she had her baby and was back at work. She's an excellent [professional] and we didn't want to lose her, but she said she found she couldn't give 100% at home and 100% here, so she thought she should stay home. Now she's working here three days a week".

and...

> "We had an excellent technician and she didn't want to work full-time any more. She was ready to leave. People like her are hard to find, so we met with her. As it turned out, she was willing to stay if we could offer something less than full-time. She had a friend who would share the job with her -- 3 and 2 days a week. So we tried it. It's working beautifully."

It is also significant to note that the interviews with parents currently sharing jobs indicate that their arrangements tend to be unique within their large workplaces. Job-sharing may, on occasion, be permitted to meet the needs of individual employees, but it is far from company policy.

EMPLOYER INTEREST IN ALTERNATIVE WORK ARRANGEMENTS

For each of the programs under study, employers were asked to indicate their level of interest in learning more about the program. This question

was asked regardless of whether or not the program was in effect in the employer's workplace. Table 6 reports the proportion of employers indicating that they were 'fairly interested' or 'very interested' in each of the various programs.

TABLE 6

Employers Indicating Interest in Alternative Work Arrangements

Arrangement	Percent of Employers Interested
Services to families (e.g., counselling, employee assistance programs, seminars, insurance benefits, etc.)	32.2
Flex-time	26.4
Work-related day care	26.0
Part-time work with prorated benefits	25.3
Job-sharing	23.9
Maternity and adoption leave	22.6
Paid leave for child and family responsibilities	20.5
Paternity and adoption leave	16.6
Work-at-home	15.0

The greatest expression of employer interest is in the miscellaneous collection of 'other services to families,' including a variety of benefits and programs. Almost one-third of the employers (32.2%) indicated an interest in learning more about one or more such programs.

Between one-fifth and one quarter of the employers indicated interest in most of the other programs, with the exception of paternity/adoption leave

and work-at-home, which elicited the interest of 16.6% and 15.0% of employers, respectively.

A comparision of employers' expressed interest in the various programs with the data on actual prevalence (see Tables 1 and 2) indicates several large discrepancies -- possibly suggesting areas where future growth in these programs may be anticipated. Although over one-quarter of employers claim to be interested in more information about work-related day care, less than half of one percent currently offer such programs. Similarly, while almost one-quarter of employers indicate an interest in job-sharing, fewer than 6% report having such programs at present. These may be areas where change will be observed in the near future. These results may also indicate areas where it will be useful to provide employers with information on developing particular workplace programs.

THE PARENTS' PERSPECTIVE ON ALTERNATIVE WORK ARRANGEMENTS

Method

Personal interviews were conducted with parents involved with four of the alternative work arrangments: job-sharing; flex-time; electronic homework; and work-related day care. Respondents were identified through two channels -- referrals from employers known to have alternative work arrangements and referrals from other parent respondents. The interviews were conducted between May and August, 1985.

Twenty interviews were conducted, including four job-sharers, six home-workers, five workers on flex-time, and five users of work-related day care. All but two of the respondents were working mothers; the two male respondents had children in work-related day care programs.

Interviews were conducted in respondents' homes. The interview format included structured as well as open-ended questions. Interviews were tape recorded with respondents' permission.

Respondents' attitudes toward their work and their motivations for becoming involved with an alternative work arrangement were probed in the interviews. Where appropriate, respondents were asked to compare their experiences with alternative work arrangements with prior, more traditional work experiences.

Following a brief summary of the experiences common to all of the parents, are descriptions of each of these four work arrangements from the parents' perspective.

Summary of Findings

Most of the parents interviewed reported that their main reason for pursuing alternative work arrangements related to their child care needs. Arrangements that involved flexible or reduced work hours allowed two-parent families to provide care for their children without using substitute day care arrangements. All of the homeworkers reported that they had begun working at home specifically so that they could be at home with young children. With regard to work-related day care, all but one of the 5 respondents stated that the day care was certainly an incentive for their remaining at their current workplace.

Virtually all of the parents interviewed felt 'privileged' to be able to work in these alternative work arrangements. A number of those involved with job-sharing, flex-time or homework acknowledged that they were losing out on some benefits. They felt that it was worth their while to forfeit such benefits in exchange for the added flexibility. One job-sharer stated that she had known she would not be entitled to benefits if she job-shared, but that she desperately wanted the opportunity to participate in a job-sharing arrangement, and felt 'lucky to do so'. The themes of 'luck' and 'good fortune' came up frequently in the interviews with the parents working in these arrangements.

Four Alternative Work Arrangements

- **Job-Sharing**

Job-sharing is a voluntary arrangement in which two employees share one full-time position. Each of the four job-sharers interviewed was sharing a full-time position with one other person. The shared positions included both administrative and professional work. Some received fringe benefits, others did not. In each instance, the respondents reported that their arrangement was unique in their organization -- that there were no other job-sharing teams in existence.

For the most part, the advantages of job-sharing were described in relation to personal, family-related needs. A job-sharer with two young children, expecting a third...

> "At the moment, this is the only solution to working and having a family. When you're looking after kids, it's difficult to work full-time... I'm not comfortable with having the kids with someone else all the time. Nine-to-five would have been difficult."

Another job-sharer with young, school-age children...

> "It enables me to have flexibility. I can spend time at the childrens' school. It gives me after-school time with my kids."

The disadvantages cited concern mainly the lack of benefits for job sharers...

> "The big thing about job-sharing is benefits, or the lack of them. We're looking at sick pay and long-term disability, dental plan -- especially with a family -- that's a big one. But it is a benefit for me to have a career and be with my kids. I'm comfortable with that. I will take it without benefits."

- **Flex-Time**

The prime motivation of those working flex-time was the saving in child care expenses -- and the elimination of the need for child care outside the family. Respondents working flex-time were married women with young pre-school and school-age children. Most worked at clerical and data entry jobs. Flex-time allowed them to accomodate their work schedules to the husband's hours:

> "Our arrangement works out well. My husband works evenings, from 5 p.m until 1:30 or 2 a.m. My work hours are from 7 a.m. until 4 p.m. We avoid child care expenses and it gives the kids enough time to spend with both parents. If there's an hour between when my husband has gone to work and I come home, we have a babysitter."

- **Work-At-Home**

Working at home by computer -- whether as a systems analyst, a word processor, or a data entry operator -- can permit a high level of flexibiltiy in work schedule. The homeworkers interviewed all required such flexibility to care for their children and meet other demands of family life.

The homeworkers doing clerical jobs tended to own their own computers and other equipment used in their electronic homework. They cited this expense as a key disadvantage of working at home.

Other problems for the homeworkers at all job levels included the social isolation of their work and the lack of opportunities for training and professional development. In addition to being excluded from formal training programs, they also missed out on opportunities to learn new skills and acquire information from colleagues. The problem of interruptions from family members and friends was also cited.

- **Work-Related Day Care**

> "As a parent with a toddler in a workplace day care, I think such programs are a wonderful idea. If they had more workplace day cares, there would be more productive, long-term employees. You feel at peace being close to your child. You're more productive".

> "I've had my son in the workplace day care for a year now. There's a comfort that if he's sick, I could get there within two minutes. I feel more comfortable knowing he's here. That's got to do something for productivity. I don't worry about him all day long. I used to have problems finding a babysitter and worried all day about how he was doing. Now I know that if there's a problem, they'll call... If I left this job, it would really be hard without the day care'."

While most of the parents using workplace day care consider it to be a major boon, they realize that it does not solve all of the child care needs of working parents. While they feel quite fortunate to have access to such a resource, they note a number of associated problems. In particular, they observe, that when a child is sick, the day care arrangement breaks down, and one parent must stay home. Overtime work also poses a problem, since the child must be picked up at a scheduled time. In a more general concern, the parents report that using day care at the workplace of one of the parents gives that parent sole responsibility for the child's day care.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Results of the survey of employers reveal that alternative work arrangements have not yet become the norm. Employers who offer flexible work schedules and workplace supports for families are relatively few and far between. When flexible work arrangements do exist, it may be only the professional or highly-trained technical employees who are eligible for such programs. Clearly, we have not reached a point where flexible work arrangements can be considered a right of working parents and others with family responsibilities.

The interviews with working parents indicate that alternate work arrangements can provide some measure of help in reducing work/family stress. Flexible work schedules, job-sharing, parental leave, work-at-home, and work-related child care programs can assist parents with the delicate balancing act between work and family responsibilities.

For working parents, opting for workplace flexibility may involve sacrificing benefits, job-security, or chances for advancement. These are tradeoffs that can make these working parents second class employees.

A variety of social and economic forces at work in today's labour markets would direct employers, planners and policymakers to look more closely at increasing options for flexible work programs. Such varied factors as increasing female labour force participation, growing concern with the role of fathers in children's development, and rising interest in job redistribution as a response to high rates of unemployment, all point to a need for alternatives to the traditional, full-time, nine-to-five job.

APPENDIX

A DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH METHODS FOR MAILED SURVEY OF EMPLOYERS

The survey utilized a random sample of Metropolitan Toronto employment establishments, stratified by size of establishment. The sample was drawn from the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Department's of 1984 Land Use and Assessment Data Bank. Because the study had a particular interest in very large employment establishments, i.e., those with at least 500 employees, this category was over-sampled. Table A1 indicates the relative proportions of employment establishments by size in Metropolitan Toronto, and in the sample.

Because different sampling weights were used in selection of the sample, it was necessary to weight the data so that each establishment was correctly represented in the analysis. Statistical estimates based on unweighted data would be biased in the direction of the larger firms. The analysis of the data in the accompanying report uses only the weighted data; unweighted data appear only in this Appendix on methods. The weighted sample is representative of the population of employing organizations in Metropolitan Toronto with 50 or more employees.

Following the selection of the sample, each establishment was contacted by telephone to determine the appropriate contact person for the survey. In most instances, the respondent was the director of personnel.

All respondents received an initial mailing of the questionnaire with a covering letter describing the project, as well as a letter of support for the project from the president of a large, well-known manufacturing firm. After three weeks, a second mailing with a duplicate questionnaire was sent to those who had not replied. Non-respondents to the second mailing were

contacted by telephone.

The survey was mailed to a sample of 1012 establishments; a total of 494 completed questionnaires was received, yielding a response rate of 49%. Table A2 presents rates of response for each of the three strata. It is clear from the table that response rates were considerably higher for the larger organizations. This difference may indicate a greater interest or awareness of work and family issues among larger organizations, or might simply result from the larger firms having available the staff resources to provide the information requested on the questionnaire.

A comparison was made of the respondents and the non-respondents with regard to industrial sector (Table A3) and size of establishment (Table A4). Examination of both of these tables reveals some response bias in the survey. Table A3 indicates that while manufacturing and construction firms represent the largest category of respondents, the proportion of such firms is somewhat smaller among respondents than among non-respondents. Table A3 appears also to indicate considerably more respondents in the 'other' category, as compared with the non-respondents. This however, is most likely attributable to response-error, i.e., respondents not understanding this classification.

Examination of Table A4 reveals that the larger establishments were more likely than the smaller establishments to respond to the survey.

In general, however, the final sample appears free of serious bias with regard to industrial sector or size.

TABLE A1

Distribution of Sampled Employers and Population of Establishments by size of Establishments with 50 or more Employees*

STRATUM	SAMPLED EMPLOYERS	(N)	POPULATION OF EMPLOYMENT ESTABLISHMENTS IN METROPOLITAN TORONTO	(N)
Medium (50 - 99 employees)	26%	(132)	52%	(1,977)
Large (100 - 499 employees)	40%	(196)	41%	(1,572)
Very Large (500 + employees)	33%	(166)	7%	(254)
TOTAL	100%	(496)	100%	(3,803)

* Source: Metropolitan Toronto, Department of Planning, Employment, Land Use and Assessment Data File, 1984.

TABLE A2

EMPLOYER SAMPLE SIZE AND RESPONSE RATE

STRATUM	FINAL SAMPLE SIZE	RESPONSE RATE	MAILED SAMPLE SIZE
Medium (50-99 employees)	132	30%	435
Large (100-499 employees)	196	52%	374
Very Large	166	82%	203
TOTAL	494	49%	1012

TABLE A3

Comparison of Non-Respondents and Respondents
by Industrial Sector

Sector	Non-Respondents (n)	%	Respondents (n)	%
1) Manufacturing & Construction	(251)	48	(195)	39
2) Transportation, Communication & Utilities	(14)	3	(23)	5
3) Trade, (Wholesale, Retail)	(67)	13	(43)	9
4) Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	(51)	10	(55)	11
5) Personal Services (Recreation, Accomodation, Food)	(49)	9	(29)	6
6) Health & Welfare	(41)	8	(32)	6
7) Education, Public Administration	(33)	6	(29)	6
8) Other	(12)	2	(88)	18
TOTAL	(518)	100%	(494)	100%

TABLE A4

Comparison of Non-Respondents and Respondents
by Size of Establishment

	Non-Respondents		Respondents	
Establishment Size	(n)	%	(n)	%
Medium (50-99 employees)	(303)	58	(132)	27
Large (100-499 employees)	(178)	35	(196)	40
Very Large (500 + employees)	(37)	7	(166)	33
TOTAL	(518)	100%	(494)	100%